

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20-21, and 23-25 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 5-11 and 15-18 and 20 are allowed and that claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 22, 24, and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by MacInnis et al (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0017398) in view of Ludtke et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0089517) and further in view of Shinoda (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,322). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of MacInnis, Ludtke, and Shinoda teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 2, and 12.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "transferring the image data managed by the host system as a packet unit to the display via the interface, wherein the packet unit comprises a header indicating that the packet unit corresponds to the window." Claim 12 claims, *inter alia*, "image data transfer means for transferring image data to the display after packetizing the image data into a packet unit corresponding to a window that is a display area in an image space of which the application is conscious, wherein the packet unit comprises a header indicating that the packet unit corresponds to the window."

MacInnis teaches a graphics integrated circuit chip used in a set-top box for controlling a television display (see Abstract). MacInnis does not teach or suggest a packet unit comprising a header indicating that the packet unit corresponds to a window, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 12. MacInnis teaches that a burst length may be assigned to each

task (see page 3, paragraph [0051]). The burst of MacInnis does not include a header, much less that a header indicates that the burst corresponds to a window. MacInnis teaches that a burst corresponds to a task (see page 3, paragraph [0051]). The task based burst of MacInnis does not correspond to windows. Therefore, MacInnis fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1 and 12.

Ludtke teaches that each packet of isochronous data within the stream of on-screen-display graphics data includes an address value (see page 5, paragraph [0035]). Ludtke does not teach or suggest a packet unit comprising a header indicating that the packet unit corresponds to a window, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 12. Ludtke's packets have address values defining a location on an entire screen. The address values of Ludtke do not correspond to a window, a sub-area of a screen or display area. Therefore, Ludtke fails to cure the deficiencies of MacInnis.

Shinoda teaches the transmission of dynamic image data that performs retransmissions when an error occurs in the transmitted data (see Abstract). Shinoda does not teach or suggest a packet unit comprising a header indicating that the packet unit corresponds to a window, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 12. Shinoda teaches MPEG image data (see col. 3, lines 17-22). MPEG implements frames, wherein header information of each frame indicates the type of picture of each frame (see col. 8, lines 26-29). An indication of a picture type does not indicate that the packet unit corresponds to the window, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 12. Therefore, Shinoda fails to cure the deficiencies of MacInnis and Ludtke.

The combined teachings of MacInnis, Ludtke and Shinoda fail to teach or suggest a packet unit comprising a header indicating that the packet unit corresponds to a window, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 12. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 2 is believed

to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,765). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of MacInnis and Maeda teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 23.

Claim 23 claims, *inter alia*, "a header portion including information indicating which window the packet belongs to; a body portion including image data belonging to the sub area for the display and information relating to an address of the sub area; and a footer portion including information for confirming a transfer error."

MacInnis teaches a graphics integrated circuit chip used in a set-top box for controlling a television display (see Abstract). MacInnis does not teach or suggest a packet "a header portion including information indicating which window the packet belongs to" as claimed in claim 23. MacInnis teaches that a burst length may be assigned to each task (see page 3, paragraph [0051]). MacInnis does not teach that a burst includes a header, much less a header portion including information indicating which window the packet belongs to. MacInnis teaches a task based burst. The task based burst of MacInnis does not correspond to a window or sub-unit of a display area. Therefore, MacInnis fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 23.

Maeda teaches a data transmission apparatus having a computation device for computing a transmission error detection code from the structure data stored (see Abstract). Maeda does not teach or suggest a header portion including information indicating which window the packet belongs to, as claimed in claim 23. Maeda teaches different headers such as a frame header in a JPEG image (see col. 35, lines 11-22) and a header indicating a program (see col. 35, lines 54-

58). However, none of the headers taught by Maeda teach or suggest a header portion including information indicating which window a packet belongs to, essentially as claimed in claim 23. For example, a JPEG header indicates that an image conforms to the JPEG standard, but does not indicate a window. The window is a region in an image space, essentially as claimed in claim 23. Maeda does not teach or suggest a header indicating a window in an image space. Therefore, Maeda fails to cure the deficiencies of MacInnis. Therefore, the combined teachings of MacInnis and Maeda fail to teach or suggest "a header portion including information indicating which window the packet belongs to" as claimed in claim 23. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), as being anticipated by MacInnis. The Examiner stated essentially that MacInnis teaches all the limitations of claim 21.


Claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, "a control line for indicating a valid packet period in the variable-length packet data, wherein the control line uses an enable signal including predetermined bits in the interface for transferring the packet data."

Claim 21 has been amended to include the allowable limitations of claim 22. Therefore, claim 21 is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-18, 20-21, and 23-25 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Nathaniel T. Wallace

Reg. No. 48,909

Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC

130 Woodbury Road

Woodbury, New York 11797

TEL: (516) 692-8888

FAX: (516) 692-8889